

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/698,317	10/27/2000	Byung Jin Choi	PA09-06V02	6298
75	590 02/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Kenneth C. Brooks			DOUGHERTY, THOMAS M	
Molecular Impr Legal Dept.	rints, Inc.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 81536			2834	
Austin, TX 78	3708		DATE MAILED: 02/20/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			N.			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/698,317	CHOI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Thomas M. Dougherty	2834				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cf after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by see Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re n. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT statute, cause the application to become ABA	oly be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	28 November 2003.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 77-103 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) 87-103 is/are wit 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 77 and 86 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 78-85 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	hdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Example 1	miner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b) objected to b	y the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the constant of the con		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International But 	nents have been received. nents have been received in Ap priority documents have been r	plication No				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	eceived.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su					
2)		Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
3) M Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/St Paper No(s)/Mail Date 602,203,1203.	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings have been noted as being informal by the Applicants. The proposed changes to the drawings in the paper of 07/07/03 is approved by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 77 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (US 6,411,010). Suzuki et al. show (fig. 7) a device to orientate a body (303) with respect to a surface (301) spaced apart from said body (303), said device comprising: a flexure system (304); and a body (303) connected to said flexure system (304), with said flexure system (304) adapted to position said body (303) in a desired orientation with respect to said surface (301) and maintain said orientation in response to a force being exerted upon said body (303).

Said flexure system (304) further comprise a plurality of piezo actuators (306a-d) attached to apply a force to rotate said body (303).

Allowable Subject Matter

Application/Control Number: 09/698,317 Page 3

Art Unit: 2834

Claims 78-85 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art fails to show or fairly suggest a pair of flexure members, each for orientation of the body and each defining its own axis of rotation wherein the two axes of rotation extend transversely to each other and the two axes are decoupled from each other. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 11/28/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The restriction is maintained for the reasons cited in the restriction requirement.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The remaining prior art cited reads on at least some aspect or aspects of the claimed invention.

Direct inquiry to Examiner Dougherty at (571) 272-2022.

February 13, 2004

THOMAS M. DOUGHER PRIMARY EXAMINER